

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as currently amended and in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 8-11, 13, 14, 16, and 19 are currently active in this case. Claims 1, 13, 14, and 19 have been amended by the current amendment. No new matter has been added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claim 19 was rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph; Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,136,179 to Ohara; Claims 1, 2, and 10-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,782,426 to Kuroshima in view of Ohara; Claims 8 and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroshima and Ohara in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,584,539 to James; Claim 14 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroshima and Ohara in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,804,022 to Fujiwara et al.; Claim 15 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroshima and Ohara in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0011805 to Yacoub; and Claim 16 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroshima and Ohara in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,597,783 to Tada et al.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claim 19 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as failing the written description requirement. Applicants respectfully point out that Figure 2 illustrates an embodiment wherein the scanner is integrated within the server 3 and is thus connected to the network only through the server. See scanner 31, LAN 4, and serial bus 24 illustrated in Figure 2. Thus, the rejection of claim 19 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, should be withdrawn.

The present invention (Claim 1 as amended) is directed to an image processing multifunction system including a plurality of printers and a server integrated with a scanner. The system further includes a printer selecting unit configured to select a printer to which

image data is supplied, and a display controller configured to make the operation unit of the scanner display the printer selected by the printer selecting unit. The scanner is configured to acquire image data of a document and the server is configured to send the image data acquired by the scanner to the printer selected for printing. The scanner includes an operation unit configured such that the scanner can be operated in a copy mode by setting (i) the copy mode, (ii) a number of copies, and (iii) a mode content using the operation unit, and when in the copy mode the acquired image data is printed by the selected printer and the selected printer is identified by the operation unit.

Claim 16 is directed to a server including, among other things, a scanner engine configured to acquire image data of a document. Claim 16 also defines the printer selecting unit, operating unit, and display controller features defined by claim 1.

Finally, independent Claim 19 is directed to a scanner including an interface connected to a server. The server is connected with a network of client computers and a plurality of printers via distinct interfaces, and the scanner is connected to the network only through the server. Claim 19 also defines the printer selecting unit, operating unit, and display controller features defined by claim 1. Claim 19 has been amended to clarify that the network encompasses a plurality of client computers and that the server is connected with the network of client computers and the plurality of printers via distinct interfaces.

In contrast to Claim 19, Ohara describes a configuration wherein a scanner is connected to a plurality of printers via a printing management server 1. See Figure 1. Ohara fails to teach or suggest that the server is connected with a network of client computers and or that the server is connected with the network of client computers and the plurality of printers using distinct interfaces. Because Ohara relies upon a printing management server, Ohara also fails to teach or suggest a scanner including a printer selecting unit or a display controller

configured to identify the selected printer using the operation unit. Thus, Ohara is not believed to anticipate or render obvious the subject matter defined by claim 19.

Claim 1 has been amended to include the subject matter of claims 2, 12, and 15.

Claim 16 has been amended to include the same features.

The Official Action asserts that Kuroshima discloses a server integrated with a scanner. Applicants respectfully point out that col. 10, lines 48-55 of Kuroshima merely discloses that the server may be constructed as a copy machine which integrates a scanner and a printer. Thus, Kuroshima fails to teach or suggest a server integrated with a scanner including a printer selecting unit configured to select a printer to which image data is supplied or a display controller configured to identify the selected printer using the operation unit.

For the reasons discussed above, Ohara fails to remedy this deficiency. Thus, when considered in combination, there is no teaching or suggestion in Kuroshima and Ohara of a server integrated with a scanner engine wherein an operation unit is configured such that the scanner can be operated in a copy mode by setting (i) the copy mode, (ii) a number of copies, and (iii) a mode content using the operation unit, and when in the copy mode the acquired image data is printed by the selected printer and the selected printer is identified by the operation unit.

Because Kuroshima describes a server constructed as a copying machine integrating a scanner and a printer, a person skilled in the art would not have had a reason to connect the integrated device to a plurality of printers wherein an operation unit of the integrated device would be used to operate the scanning and copying procedure.

For the foregoing reasons, Kuroshima is not believed to anticipate or render obvious the subject matter defined by claims 1 and 16 when considered alone or in combination with

Ohara. The claims depending from claim 1 are believed to be allowable for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is believed to be allowable.

In view of the foregoing, no further issues are believed to remain. An early and favorable action is therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



James J. Kulbaski
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 34,648

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/07)

W. Todd Baker
Registration No. 45,265